

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner allowed Claim 14, but rejected Claims 1-9, 12, 13, 15 and 18-22 over the prior art, principally U.S. patent application publication no. 2002/003899 (Zernick, et al.). More specifically, Claims 1-9 and 18-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being fully anticipated by Zernick, et al; and Claims 12, 13, 21 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Zernick, et al. Claims 4 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Zernick, et al. in view of U.S. Patent 6,857,102 (Bickmore, et al.). Also, the Examiner rejected Claims 11-13 under 35 U.S.C. 112 as being indefinite. Claim 11, it may be noted, was not rejected over the prior art.

Applicants herein ask that independent Claims 1, 7, 15 and 18 be amended to better define the subject matters of these claims. Claims 2 and 5 are being amended to keep the language of these claims consistent with the language of Claim 1. Claim 3 is being cancelled to reduce the number of issues in this application. Claims 4 and 5 are being amended to be dependent from Claim 1 instead of the now cancelled Claim 3, and several features are being taken out of Claim 4 because these features are now described in Claim 1. In addition, Claim 11 is being amended to address the rejection of Claims 11-13 under 35 U.S.C. 112. Applicants also ask that, in the penultimate paragraph of Claim 14, the spelling of "where" be corrected, and minor editorial changes are being made to Claims 20 and 22.

For the reasons discussed below, Claims 11-13 are clear and definite and fully comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112. Further, all of Claims 1, 2, 4-9, 11-13, 15 and 18-22 patentably distinguish over the prior art and are allowable. The Examiner is, hence, asked to reconsider and to withdraw the rejection of Claims 1, 2, 3-9, 18 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 102, the rejections of Claims 4, 12, 13, 15, 21 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. 103, and the rejection of Claims

11-13 under 35 U.S.C. 112, and to allow Claims 1, 2, 4-9, 11-13, 15 and 18-22.

In rejecting Claims 11-13 as being indefinite, the Examiner specifically objected to several terms in independent Claim 11. In particular, the Examiner argued that the phrases "the icons" and "the files" in lines 6 and 8, respectively, of Claim 11 lack the appropriate antecedent basis. The Examiner also argued that two phrases in Claim 11, "selecting icons to represent the files," and "creating an icon representing a file," appear to be inconsistent.

Claim 11 is being amended herein to address these objections. The preamble of the claim is being amended to indicate that the purpose of the icon creator is "for creating icons and selecting icons for representing a file." The description of the "matcher" set forth in the claim is being changed to indicate that this matcher creates a multitude of icons, and that this matcher includes means for selecting a plurality of the created icons to represent the file.

These changes overcome any indefiniteness in Claim 11, and in Claims 12 and 13, which are dependent from Claim 11. In particular, it is believed that, with these changes, the terms "file," "icon" and "icons" are properly introduced and appropriately used in the Claim 11. The Examiner is thus requested to reconsider and to withdraw the rejection of Claims 11-13 under 35 U.S.C. 112.

Moreover, since Claim 11 was not rejected over the prior art, it is believed that Claim 11 patentably distinguishes over the prior art and is allowable. Claims 12 and 13, being dependent from Claim 11, are allowable therewith. Accordingly, the Examiner is also asked to reconsider and to withdraw the rejection of Claims 12 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. 103.

Independent Claims 1, 7, 15 and 18 also patentably distinguish over the prior art. This is because the references of record do not disclose or suggest the formation and use of the

composite icons, as described in these claims.

More specifically, this invention provides procedures for displaying icons representing text files. These icons help a user find data files in which they are interested. In one embodiment of the invention, a content extractor determines a plurality of topics of a text file, and each of a plurality of icons is associated with a respective one of those topics. Weighted values are assigned to each of those topics, and a selector chooses at least one of the icons to represent the text file on the basis of the weighted values assigned to the topics.

Also, in one embodiment of the invention, a composite icon is formed of the plurality of icons selected to represent the plurality of topics of a text file. The use of a composite icon, which includes a plurality of individual icons selected to represent the topics of a text file, is very useful because it better represents many text files. This is because many text files, in fact, describe a plurality of topics. Important information can be overlooked by a user when a text file is represented by only one icon.

Zernick, et al. describes methods and systems for showing icons that represent data pages. In the procedure disclosed in this reference, pages are associated with categories that can be represented by icons. As discussed in Zernick, et al. in paragraph 64, a signature is assigned to each page, and the categories most closely related to the signature for each page are identified and assigned a weight. These weighted categories are then evaluated to determine how to group the web pages.

Important features that are not shown in or suggested by the prior art, are described in independent Claims 1, 7, 15 and 18. In particular, Claims 1 and 7 describe means for creating a composite icon including selected ones of a plurality of icons associated with the topics of a file, and these claims describe the further feature that each of these icons of the composite icon has an

index attachment which opens directly to the file.

Claims 15 and 18 describe analogous features. More specifically, Claim 15 is directed to a method for creating icons, and Claim 18 is directed to a program storage device embodying a composite program for determining and displaying icons representing a file. Both of these claims describes the features of creating a composite icon for a file from or including a plurality of icons generated or associated with the topics of the file, and that each of these icons of the composite icon has an index attachment which opens directly to the file.

The other references of record have been reviewed, and whether these other references are considered individually or in combination, they also fail to teach or suggest the formation or creation and use of the composite icon in the manner described in Claims 1, 7, 15 and 18.

For example, Bickmore, et al. was cited in the Office Action for its disclosure in Figure 1 of a composite icon. Applicants respectfully submit, however, that Figure 1 of Bickmore, et al. does not show a composite icon. Instead this Figure of Bickmore, et al. shows how a document can be re-authored into a list of sections. Those section lists, though, are not icons, and, moreover, these lists do not pictorially or intuitively represent to a user the topics of the document, as the icons of the present invention do.

Because of the above-discussed differences between Claims 1, 7, 15 and 18 and the prior art, and because of the advantages associated with those differences, these Claims patentably distinguish over the prior art and are allowable. Claims 2, 4-6 and 20-22 are dependent from Claim 1 and are allowable therewith; and Claims 8 and 9 are dependent from, and are allowable with, Claim 7. Further, Claims 16 and 17 are dependent from, and are allowable with, Claim 15; and Claim 19 is dependent from Claim 18 and is allowable therewith.


Applicants note that the changes requested herein to independent Claims 1, 7, 15 and 18 add to these claims features already described in one or more of the other claims. For instance, Claims 11 and 15 already describe the formation or creation of a composite icon including a plurality of icons representing or associated with a text file. Also, Claim 14 presently describes the feature that each of the icons of the composite icon has an index attachment that opens directly to the file. Other requested changes to the claims are of an editorial nature. For instance, Claims 4 and 5 are being amended to be dependent from Claim 1 instead of the now cancelled Claim 3, and in Claim 5, "several icons" is being changed to "selected icons." Also, in Claim 7, "one or more topics" is being changed to "a plurality of topics," and in Claim 20, the term "which may be hyperlinks" is being changed to "which includes hyperlinks."

It is thus believed that the present Amendment does not require any further searching by the Examiner. Moreover, this Amendment, as explained above, places this application in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is believed that entry of this Amendment is appropriate, and such entry is respectfully requested.

For the reasons discussed above, the Examiner is requested to reconsider and to withdraw the rejection of Claims 11-13 under 35 U.S.C. §112. The Examiner is also respectfully asked to reconsider and to withdraw the rejection of Claims 1, 2, 5-9 and 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. §102,

and the rejections of Claims 4, 12, 13, 15, 21 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §103, and to allow Claims 1, 2 4-9, 11-13, 15 and 18-22. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicants' Attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is asked to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully Submitted,


John S. Sensny
Registration No. 28,757
Attorney for Applicants

Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser
400 Garden City Plaza
Suite 300
Garden City, NY 11530
(516) 742-4343

JSS:ahs